

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
2465 E. Bayshore Road, Suite 406
Palo Alto, California 94303
Faxsimile (650) 493-4549
Telephone (650) 493-4540

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL

Date: October 13, 2003
To: Examiner Pillai
Organization: USPTO
Fax Number: (703) 746-9272
Phone Number: (703) 305-7691
From: Joyce Tom
Re: 09/675,468 (INTERVIEW REQUEST)

This is page 1 of 4 pages.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

Date: October 13, 2003

Ibbotson, et al.

Serial No.: 09/675,468

Group Art Unit: 2173

Filed: September 28, 2000

Examiner: Pillai, Namitha

For: METHOD AND TOOL FOR GRAPHICALLY DEFINING AN
EXPRESSION

Commissioner for Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

AGENDA FOR INTERVIEW

Applicants request an interview in the above referenced case and submit the following agenda:

A. Finality of Office Action

Applicants respectfully request that the finality of the rejection be withdrawn. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner presented new grounds of rejection and stated that the action was made final because Applicants' amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Applicants disagree.

In the last response, Applicants amended claims 1, 18, 19 and 20 by incorporating the limitations of claim 10. Claim 10 was canceled. Claims 11, 12, 13 and 14 were amended to change claim dependency only. None of the amendments, particularly those to claims 1, 18-20 presented matter not already claimed in claim 10. Accordingly, the finality is improper because none of the amendments necessitated the new grounds of

rejection. MPEP 706.07(a).

B. Claims 1 and 18-20 are allowable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,883)

Lee fails to teach or suggest “an output data structure wherein any associated list item defines a formatting definition,” as recited in claims 1, 18-20. Moreover, Lee fails to teach or suggest “generating an expression based on the structure of each tree and any list items associated with respective nodes of a tree,” as recited in claims 1, 18-20.

Lee is directed to creating a set of validation rules for a group of fields in an electronic form. The form is graphically represented as a tree with nodes representing fields to be filled out in the form. Validation rule(s) for a field govern what type of information can be entered in that field. The validation rule(s) are represented as subnode(s) of the field.

Lee’s tree structure represents an electronic form. None of the electronic form tree structures represents “an *output* data structure.” Furthermore, any format definition provided by a validation rule in Lee is directed to *an input* format definition for the input data. Lee’s tree structure fails to teach or suggest “an output data structure wherein any associated list item defines a formatting definition,” as recited in the independent claims.

In addition, Lee provides no teaching or suggestion of taking “a graphic definition of an expression provided by a user” through an interface and “generating the expression based on the structure of each tree and any list items associated,” as recited in the independent claims. In Lee, the user creates a set of validation rules for a field by choosing from a list of expressions provided by a GUI and filling in the appropriate conditions. Once created, the validation rules become a part of the tree structure

representing the electronic form.

Lee's tree structure is a graphic definition of the electronic form, *not* a graphic definition of an expression, and Lee fails to teach or suggest "generating the expression based on the structure of each tree," as recited in the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, and 18-20 are allowable over Lee.

C. Dependent claims are allowable because base claims are allowable over cited references.